

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application based on the following remarks are respectfully requested. Claims 11-21 have been amended. New claims 22-24 have been added. Support for the amendments and the new claims may be found throughout the specification, for example at page 6, lines 20-29. No new matter has been added. Upon entry of the above amendments, claims 11-24, as amended, will be pending.

Claims 12-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as indefinite. The amendments to the claims are believed to place them in full compliance with 35 U.S.C. § 112. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 11-21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,994,493 to Krebs ("Krebs") in view of U.S. Patent 4,383,051 to Meyborg, *et al.* ("Meyborg") and U.S. Patent 4,443,563 to Dirlikov, *et al.* ("Dirlikov"). Applicants respectfully disagree. Krebs does not teach or suggest the use of chain extenders. Furthermore, Krebs is directed to "moisture-curing" polyurethanes (See column 1, lines 6, 11, 17-18 and 27, column 3, line 57, column 4, lines 15 and 24, column 6, line 2, column 8, line 9 and the claims), and one of ordinary skill in the art would not use chain extenders in the moisture-curing polyurethanes of Krebs because the chain extenders would alter the nature of the polyurethane composition such that it would no longer be a "moisture-curing" polyurethane. Thus, the proposed modification to Krebs would impermissibly render Krebs unsatisfactory for its intended purpose and would impermissibly change the principle of operation of the Krebs reference (See MPEP §2143.01 V and VI). Accordingly, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to combine the teachings of Krebs with the teachings of Meyborg.

In addition, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to combine the teachings of Krebs with the teachings of Dirlikov. Specifically, the moisture-curing polyurethanes of Krebs necessarily have a very low melt viscosity (See Abstract). In contrast, Dirlikov uses rigid compounds (column 2, line 10) to form its polyurethanes. One of ordinary skill in the art would know that such rigid compounds result in high melt and solution viscosities unsuited for moisture-curing

polyurethanes. Accordingly, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to combine the teachings of Dirlikov with Krebs.

Finally, neither, Meyborg nor Dirlikov teach or suggest a polyester component according to the present invention. Specifically, neither reference teaches or suggests a polyester component comprising 1,4:3,6 dianhydrohexitol.

For at least these reasons Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections.

Therefore, all objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Should any issues remain unresolved, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney for Applicants at the telephone number indicated below in order to expeditiously resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

MAYER BROWN ROWE & MAW LLP

By: 

John E. Mauk
Registration No. 54,579
Direct No. (202) 263-3255

Paul L. Sharer
Registration No. 36,004
Direct No. (202) 263-3340

Intellectual Property Group
1909 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006-1101
(202) 263-3000 Telephone
(202) 263-3300 Facsimile

Date: April 10, 2006